

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-35 and 65-91 are pending in the present application.

Claims 1-35 are rejected.

Claims 65-91 are new

Claims 36-64 are previously cancelled.

Claims 14, 22, and 30 are amended herein.

1. **Introduction**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the phone conversation of July 25, 2007 and consideration of our arguments discussed concerning the present application.

2. **Rejections under 35 USC § 103(a)**

a. *Claims 1-13, 31 and 32*

In the Office action, claims 1-13, 31 and 32 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over either United States patent 6,355,198 to Kim et al. (“*Kim*”) in combination with United States patent 4,908,216 to Dullings et al (“*Dullings*”) or United States patent application publication 2003/0062334 to Lee et al. (“*Lee*”) in combination with *Dullings*.

Claim 1 defines a method of patterning a substrate with a template having a mold, the method including, *inter alia*, positioning conformable material between the substrate and the mold; filling a volume defined between the mold and the substrate with the conformable material through capillary action between the conformable material and the mold and the substrate; and applying a pulling force on at least one of the substrate and the mold to compensate for tensile forces, associated with the capillary action, upon the mold (emphasis added).

The Examiner specifically added *Dullings* to the other prior art to address the underlined language. In response, Applicants respectfully assert that *Dullings* is completely silent with respect to applying a pulling force on at least one of a substrate and a mold to

compensate for tensile forces, associated with capillary action between a conformable material and the mold and the substrate, upon the mold. In contrast, *Dullings* teaches having a “mould in contact with the mould part...move in a direction to follow the moulded part as the latter changes its dimensions during hardening.” See column 2, lines 19-21. More specifically, *Dullings* teaches compensating for “relative displacements between the surface of the mould and the surface of the moulded part.” See column 1, lines 13-27. The relative displacements are a result of a volumetric reduction of the composition during polymerization. See *id*. The “relative displacements between the mould and the mould part are thereby avoided and shearing forces which could...cause projects [of the moulded part] to be torn off...” See column 2, lines 30-34. *Dullings* has no mention of applying a pulling force on at least one of the substrate and the mold to compensate for tensile forces, associated with the capillary action, upon the mold. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that a *prima facie* case of obviousness is not present with respect to claim 1, since the combination of the prior art does not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. Further, Applicants respectfully assert that a *prima facie* case of obviousness is not present with respect to claims 2-13, 31, 32, and 65-67, depending from claim 1, with their respective limitations.

b. *Claims 14-30 and 33-35*

In the Office action, claims 14-30 and 33-35 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over United States patent 6,334,960 to Willson et al. (“*Willson*”) in combination with either *Kim* or *Lee* and further in view of *Dullings*.

Applicants respectfully contend that the arguments set forth above with respect to claims 14 and 22 apply with equal weight here and a *prima facie* case of obviousness is not present with respect to claim 15-21, 30, 33, 34, and 68-70, depending from claim 14, and claims 23-29, 35, and 71-73, depending from claim 22, with their respective limitations.

3. New claims

Applicants submit new claims 65-97 to secure an appropriate scope of the invention. The cited prior art does not teach or suggest the limitations within these claims. To that end, Applicants request examination and allowance of the new claims.

4. Conclusion

As a result of the foregoing, it is asserted by Applicants that claims 1-35 and 65-91 in the present Application are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request an allowance of such claims. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner call Applicants' agent at the below listed number if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues.

Respectfully Submitted,



Michael D. Carter
Reg. No. 56,661
Legal Department
Molecular Imprints, Inc.
P.O. Box 81536
Austin, Texas 78708-1536
Telephone: 512.339.7760x316
Facsimile: 512.491.8918